



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,065	07/09/2004	Patrick Chesne	REGIM 3.3-025	1671
530 7590 04/26/2007 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			EXAMINER CROUCH, DEBORAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,065

Applicant(s)

CHESNE ET AL.

Examiner

Deborah Crouch, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 46-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 and 51-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1632

Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-45 and 51-56, in the reply filed on March 12, 2007 is acknowledged.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20, 25-33, 38-45 and 51-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of producing a rabbit by nuclear transfer comprising inserting a rabbit donor somatic cell into an enucleated rabbit mammalian oocyte of the same species as the donor cell to produce a nuclear transfer embryo, activating the oocyte cycloheximide and 6-dimethylamino purine to produce a reconstituted embryo, transfer of the reconstituted embryo to the uterus of a 22 hour asynchronous female rabbit, and permitting development of the reconstituted embryo to term, does not reasonably provide enablement for the claims as written. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Neither the specification nor the claims teach or provide a means through which to determine the variable "T" in $t = t_0 + T$ (+/- 25% T). The claims and the specification never discuss determining "T" or providing a value for "T." Without knowing "t" one could not calculate "T." Without "T" one would not know the asynchrony of development between two embryos to determine when after fertilization an embryo should be transferred to the uterus of a recipient female. Further, the specification and the claims do not clearly define "t₀." That is "t₀" is the time of crossing a vasectomized male with a female or the time of crossing a fertile male with a female, each to produce an embryo. However, the specification and the

Art Unit: 1632

claims do not state exactly what "t₀" measures. Is the hour/minute of mating? Is it the time post-ovulation? More explanation is needed for the variables in the formula for the formula, and the method, to be used. Additionally, the only means taught by the specification to determine "T" is through cell or blastomere counting of the embryos. If one knows the embryo is a one-cell, 2-cell, 4-cell, 8-cell, 16-cell, morula or blastocyst stage embryo, then the determination has been completed.

The claims are further not enabled because claim 1 states "the determination taking place at on or before the day of uterine implantation of said second embryo." However, there is no transfer to a uterus step in claim 1(a)(ii). Also, the specification does discuss how to determine asynchrony of development once the embryo has been transferred to the uterus. A transferred embryo may not implant immediately into the uterine wall. It is noted that fertilized eggs do not require artificial or parthenogenetic activation. Sperm entry induces a series of events, one of which is activation of the egg. Also, the method of evaluating would need to transfer an embryo of the same species as those evaluated or the attempt to gain synchrony would be fraught with species differences.

With regards to the asynchrony between oocyte donor rabbit and embryo recipient rabbit, the specification states that transfer of 1-4 cell stage embryos to female results in no fetal rabbit development (specification, page 28, parag. [0085]). Further, the specification states NT embryos reach blastocyst stage in vitro just as the zygotes and parthenotes, but the NT embryos at day 4 about one day behind (specification, page 28, parag. [0083]). When 16 hour asynchronous females are used as recipients, the rate of implantation increases, but none of the females remained pregnant (page 29-30, bridg. parag.). Live cloned rabbits were obtained with 22 hour asynchrony (page 30, parag. [0087]). Thus, there is great unpredictability in producing live-born, cloned rabbits. Applicant has been limited to the particular method disclosed in the specification to produce cloned rabbits

Art Unit: 1632

because insufficient guidance has been provided to determine "t" given the above deficiencies in the formula.

It is noted that the claims encompass both cross-species nuclear transfer, by not specifying the reconstituted embryo was transferred to the uterus of a female of the same species, as well as encompass the production of primates by nuclear transfer. At the time of filing, cross-species nuclear transfer and the cloning of primates were not regarded enabled. Meirelles demonstrates that methods of nuclear transfer where the nuclear material of *Bos indicus* is inserted into the oocyte of *Bos taurus* produces calves comprising the nuclear material of *Bos indicus* and the mitochondria of *Bos taurus*. Meirelles *et al.* teach that previous attempts to use the *Bos* oocyte as hosts for nuclear transfer from unrelated species allowed development to the blastocyst stage, and conclude that incompatibility among the nuclear and mitochondrial genetic systems is responsible for the early arrest. Meirelles also points to similar failures using *Mus caroli* and *Mus musculus* citing Dominko. Meirelles concludes that in light of their results and the failures of the prior art, that nuclear transfer across subspecies barriers is possible (see Meirelles, pp. 351-355). In addition, the claims encompass methods of nuclear transfer when the oocyte is off a different species than the surrogate mother animal. Further, in the production of sheep goat chimeras, there were biases towards chimeras whose genotype and phenotype was most like that of the recipient, and that the successful production of chimeras resided in the neutralization of incompatibility between the chimeric embryo (Fehilly *et al* (1985), page 221, parag. 1). It is also noted the cloning of monkeys, a primate, by nuclear transfer had been successful when embryonic cells were the nuclear donor, not when somatic cells were used as nuclear donor (Mitalipov, abstract). Mitalipov further states, clearly, that somatic cell cloning, as is part of the present methods, has not been accomplished in primates (Mitalipov, page 1367, col. 2, parag, 3, lines 1-3). Simerly, states that in rhesus monkey NT units, DNA and microtubule

Art Unit: 1632

imaging showed disarrayed mitotic spindles with misaligned chromosomes, which resulted in unequal chromosome segregation and aneuploid embryos (page 297, col. 2, parag. 1, lines 5-11). Thus, the claims would not have been regarded as enabled for the breadth of cross-species nuclear transfer and/or primate cloning. These rejections can be overcome by 1) limiting the donor cell, the recipient oocyte and the surrogate mother as all being of the same species, and limiting the claims to nonprimate mammal.

Thus, the skilled artisan at the time of the instant invention would have needed to engage in an undue amount of experimentation without a predictable degree of success to implement the invention as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 23, 24, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Collas et al (1990) Biol. Reproduct. 43, pp. 877-884.

Collas teaches rabbit embryos and rabbit offspring (page 881, Table 6). While the rabbits of Collas were produced by a method different from that of the claims, there is no

Art Unit: 1632

scientific reason or evidence of record that the rabbit embryos and rabbits so produced would possess any patentable distinction. Any differences obtained, absent evidence to the contrary, would be obvious differences such as coat color variations.

[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

"The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

"Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product (*In re Ludtke*). Whether the rejection is based on "inherency" under 35 USC 102, on "prima facie obviousness" under 35 USC 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products. *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) citing *In re Brown*, 59 CCPA

Art Unit: 1632

1036, 459 F.2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (1972)).”

“When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not.” *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433. See also *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *In re Ludtke*, 441 F.2d 660, 169 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1971), *Northam Warren Corp. v. D. F. Newfield Co.*, 7 F. Supp. 773, 22 USPQ 313 (E.D.N.Y. 1934.) See MPEP 2113 and MPEP 2112.01.

Thus, Collas anticipates, or in the alternative, makes obvious the claimed invention.

Claims 22 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Costa et al. (1998) FASEB J, Vol. 12, pp. 1455-1460.

Costa teaches a transgenic rabbit and transgenic rabbit embryos (page 1456, col. 1, parag. 1 and page 1458, Figure 2). While the rabbits of Costa were produced by a method different from that of the claims, there is no scientific reason or evidence of record that the rabbit embryos and rabbits so produced would possess any patentable distinction. Any differences obtained, absent evidence to the contrary, would be obvious differences such as coat color variations.

[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,

Art Unit: 1632

698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

"The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of *prima facie* obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

"Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product (*In re Ludtke*). Whether the rejection is based on "inherency" under 35 USC 102, on "prima facie obviousness" under 35 USC 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products. *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) citing *In re Brown*, 59 CCPA 1036, 459 F.2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (1972))."

"When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433. See also *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *In re Ludtke*, 441 F.2d 660, 169 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1971), *Northam Warren*

Art Unit: 1632

Corp. v. D. F. Newfield Co., 7 F. Supp. 773, 22 USPQ 313 (E.D.N.Y. 1934.) See MPEP 2113 and MPEP 2112.01.

Thus, Costa anticipates, or in the alternative, makes obvious the claimed invention.

Claims 1-20, 25-33, 38-45 and 51-56 because the prior art did not teach or suggest the methods as presently claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Crouch, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0727. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri, 6:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on 571-272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Deborah Crouch, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1632

April 24, 2007